

umbilical width and the cross section are measurable on the phragmocone, and the suture is uncorroded. Therefore, the characters of taxonomic importance are clearly visible. There is no doubt about its identity with what we now call *Ceratites nodosus*.

4. Of course, no information was published about the exact level from which the lectotypes proposed by Rieber & Tozer (1986) and Urlichs & Mundlos (1987) originated (see para. 4 of Melville's comment). However, the species of *Ceratites* are very characteristic, and their stratigraphic range within the Upper Muschelkalk (which reaches a thickness of 70–90m) is well known since Riedel (1916), who subdivided the Upper Muschelkalk into 10 *Ceratites* Zones. This subdivision has often been confirmed and completed by different authors, e.g. Wenger (1957), Hagdorn & Simon (1985) and Urlichs (1993). Specimens comparable to the lectotype of *Ceratites nodosus* proposed by Rieber & Tozer (1986) occur in SW-Germany 20–23m above the base of the Upper Muschelkalk; those specimens comparable to the Schlothheim lectotype proposed by Urlichs & Mundlos (1987) are found at 60–65m. The lower level corresponds to the Upper Anisian and the upper to the Lower Ladinian. The phylogeny of *Ceratites* has been established from the stratigraphic ranges of the different species (Riedel, 1916; Wenger, 1957); it is one of the best known examples.

Additional reference

Urlichs, M. 1993. Zur Gliederung des Oberen Muschelkalks in Baden-Württemberg mit Ceratiten. Pp. 153–156 in Hagdorn, H. & Seilacher, A. (Eds.), *Muschelkalk, Schöntaler Symposium 1991*. Sonderbände der Gesellschaft für Naturkunde in Württemberg, vol. 2. Korb (Goldschneck).

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Clavella* Oken, 1815 and *Pennella* Oken, 1815 (Crustacea, Copepoda)

(Case 836; see BZN 50: 273–276)

G.A. Boxshall

The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

Clavella and *Pennella* are widely used in the taxonomic literature on parasitic copepods (Kabata, 1979, 1992; Hogans, 1988). Both genera have been redefined and modern redescrptions are available of their type species, *Lernaea uncinata* Müller, 1776 (now *Clavella adunca*) (in Kabata, 1979) and *Pennella diodontis* Oken, 1815 (in Hogans, 1988). There is no taxonomic confusion surrounding either genus. These generic names are also mentioned frequently in non-taxonomic, parasitological literature (e.g. Dogiel et al., 1958; Kabata, 1970; Sniesko, 1970; Möller & Anders, 1983). I am in favour of the conservation of both generic names and of the binomen *Pennella diodontis* because of their wide use in taxonomic and general parasitological literature.

Additional references

Dogiel, V.A., Petrushevskii, G.K. & Polyanski, Yu.I. 1958. *Parasitology of fishes*. Leningrad University Press, Leningrad. [English edition 1961, translated by Z. Kabata. 384 pp. Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh.]

- Kabata, Z. 1970. *Diseases of fishes. Book 1. Crustacea as enemies of fishes*. 171 pp. T.F.H. Publications, Jersey City.
- Kabata, Z. 1992. Copepods parasitic on fishes. *Synopses of the British Fauna*, (n.s.)47: 1–264.
- Möller, H. & Anders, K. 1983. *Krankheiten und Parasiten der Meeresfische*. 258 pp. Author, Kiel.
- Sniesko, S.F. 1970. *A symposium on diseases of fishes and shellfishes*. Special Publication No. 5. 526 pp. American Fisheries Society, Washington.

Comment on the proposal to conserve *Oecothea* Haliday in Curtis, 1837 and to designate *Helomyza fenestralis* as the type species (Insecta, Diptera)
(Case 2836; see BZN 50: 44–47, 235–236)

Curtis W. Sabrosky

205 Medford Leas, Medford, New Jersey 08055, U.S.A.

I support heartily the application by Woźnica & Zatwarnicki on *Oecothea* Haliday for restoring validity to its over-a-century usage.

Thompson & Mathis (1980), in their thorough and commendable study of the generic names of Haliday in Curtis (1837), erred, in my opinion, in their treatment of included species of *Oecothea*. Their designated type species, while concordant with their view of included species and the problems with these, left the long-used *Oecothea* of authors without a name (later supplied by Peterson & Gill, 1982, but not widely accepted).

The disputed problem is not availability, well elucidated by Thompson & Mathis (1980), but the type species, and the crux of this problem is what species, if any, was or were originally included. Under the plenary powers, of course, any species can be designated as type, whether or not originally included.

My catalogue of family-group names in Diptera, nearing completion, contains a detailed analysis of species numbers and position for *Oecothea*. I do not agree with Thompson & Mathis (1980) that the four species following *Oecothea* in Curtis's Addenda were necessarily originally included. Indeed, we have Haliday's (1838, p. 187) own nearly contemporaneous testimony that they were not. The importance of this paper, entitled *New British insects indicated in Mr. Curtis's Guide*, is that it is the author's explanation of his own names, merely listed in Curtis's work; his note for subgenus *Aecothea* [sic] reads: '*H[elomyza] fenestralis* is the only [italics mine] British species'. In my view, the pragmatic conclusion, considering only the 1837 *Guide*, would have been that *Oecothea* in 1837 was ambiguous and without clearly associated species, and that the type was *H. fenestralis* by subsequent monotypy in 1838. But the designation by Thompson & Mathis (1980) has caused recourse to the Commission, which the applicants have now provided.

A minor detail concerns *Aecothea* Haliday, 1838. Thompson & Mathis (1980) considered this to be an unjustified emendation of *Oecothea*. The applicants have suggested that it was 'a deliberate transliteration of Greek', which would still be an unjustified emendation. However, there is, strictly speaking, no evidence of emendation and nomenclaturally *Aecothea* must be considered an erroneous subsequent spelling.